

**CERTIFIED ACCESS SPECIALIST PROGRAM**  
**IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE**

Division of the State Architect

**Minutes of Public Meeting**  
**Tuesday, December 14, 2004**

1102 Q Street, 5th Floor, Conference Room B  
Sacramento, California

**Committee Members Present**

James Abrams  
Jürgen Dostert  
Pete Guisasola  
Daniel P. Larsen  
John Lonberg  
Gene Lozano  
Michael Paravagna  
Philip C. Rubin  
Patricia Yeager

**Committee Members Absent**

Patricia Barbosa  
Yolanda Benson  
Regina Brown

**DSA Staff Present**

Rod Higgins, Facilitator  
Karen Hodgkins  
Michael Mankin  
Karen Hodgkins  
Elizabeth Randolph  
Louise Redeen  
Derek M. Shaw  
Mark Smith

**Others Present**

Gil Delapeña, Dept. of Parks & Rec.  
James V. Vitale, PBWS Architects  
Richard Conrad  
Linda Huber  
Molly (interpreter)

1 **Call to Order and Introductions**

2 Mr. Rod Higgins called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. Participants took turns  
3 introducing themselves.

4

5 **Minutes of September 14, 2004 Meeting**

6 Mr. Higgins drew attention to the minutes of the September 14 meeting and welcomed  
7 comments. There were no suggestions or changes to the minutes. Without objection,  
8 the September 14 minutes were approved as presented.

9

1    **Staff Report 5.1, Program Administration of Certification Status**

2    Mr. Mark Smith presented Staff Report 5.1, regarding program administration of  
3    certification status in terms of quality assurance, disciplinary procedures, recertification,  
4    and ethics.

5

6    Mr. Smith noted regular performance reviews will be conducted to assure quality, and  
7    he reviewed the issues pertaining to frequency of reviews, who will conduct reviews,  
8    and selection of review samples. He observed that many of these issues are cost-  
9    sensitive. He welcomed committee input as to the adequacy of the proposed sampling  
10   frequency. Mr. Smith added that the staff plans to consult with a psychometrician to  
11   help determine an appropriate sample.

12

13   Mr. Smith discussed the type of performance review to be conducted. He noted DSA  
14   reviewers will review certified access specialists' work to identify technical deficiencies  
15   and possible conflicts of interest, and then audit candidates will be selected. Mr. Smith  
16   commented that people who score well on certification exams will be less likely to be  
17   audited; people with technical deficiencies will be audited more often. Mr. Smith said  
18   DSA would like to find a way to look at project records to help evaluate a certified  
19   access specialist's performance.

20

21   Mr. Smith suggested a possible funding mechanism might be to charge a fee for each  
22   project assessed.

23

24   Mr. Jürgen Dostert encouraged DSA to hire a psychometrician to design and validate  
25   the review process.

26

1 With respect to peer reviews, Mr. Dostert noted there might be an advantage to having  
2 an anonymous review process. He recommended creating a complaint process  
3 separate from the quality assurance program.

4

5 Mr. Michael Paravagna proposed looking at the program from a budgeting standpoint to  
6 determine which options are more feasible than others.

7

8 Mr. Philip Rubin asked what processes are currently used to review performance of  
9 architects and other professionals. He suggested using some of those programs as  
10 models.

11

12 Mr. Jim Abrams said he understood the key obstacles were cost and time. He  
13 expressed his opinion that there should be one place where everyone interested in the  
14 certified access specialist program can come together to review and agree on a  
15 process. He noted the Board of Architectural Examiners is probably the best forum  
16 available, and he recommended working with them.

17

18 In terms of disciplinary procedures, Mr. Smith said he envisioned DSA conducting about  
19 360 investigations in a three-year period, or about ten per month, from which only one  
20 of ten will be thoroughly audited.

21

22 Mr. Dan Larsen asked if there will be any standardized format for the investigations to  
23 ensure consistency. Mr. Smith noted one of the major objectives of the whole program  
24 is to bring clarity to the process of implementing disability access rights and to provide  
25 consistency statewide.

26

1 Mr. Dostert observed that auditing only one in ten of the certified access specialists will  
2 yield a very narrow view of what those people actually do; he also expressed skepticism  
3 as to whether the process will help identify and solve potential problems. He  
4 commented that it might be more productive for DSA to focus on responding to  
5 complaints. Mr. Dostert also cautioned that building owners might become reluctant to  
6 hire certified access specialists if they fear having to go through an audit.

7

8 Mr. Smith agreed that DSA's major focus should be on complaints. He noted the quality  
9 assurance reviews can be done when there are no complaints. Mr. Smith pointed out  
10 the statute indicates DSA "may" conduct quality assurance audits.

11

12 Before setting any number targets, Mr. Paravagna suggested taking a more detailed  
13 look at the resources currently available and the time the reviews are expected to take.

14

15 Mr. Larsen expressed his opinion that a complaint process would be the best way to  
16 investigate problems.

17

18 Mr. Abrams commented that the process needs to be very consistent and uniform  
19 throughout the state. He suggested using complaints as the primary reason for audits  
20 during the first year of the program, and then, if resources are available, conduct some  
21 random audits. Mr. Abrams noted DSA will get a better feel for the process over its first  
22 three years, and the program can be refined as lessons are learned.

23

24 Mr. Abrams stated that the business community is desperate to get the certified access  
25 specialist program up and running as quickly and efficiently as possible. He proposed  
26 charging an extra \$10 fee for each building permit to fund the program.

1

2 Mr. Pete Guisasola observed that the state already collects fees on local building  
3 permits, and it is not easy to institute a new fee.

4

5 Ms. Patricia Yeager noted the enabling legislation gives DSA the authority to perform  
6 periodic audits as deemed necessary, and she recommended exercising that  
7 prerogative. She advocated some sort of quality assurance sampling during the first  
8 five years of the program, and she recommended more than one a month.

9

10 Ms. Yeager said she was totally opposed to using the Board of Architectural Examiners  
11 because they lack understanding of access issues. She recommended setting up a  
12 separate review process for certified access specialists.

13

14 Ms. Yeager expressed concern about Mr. Dostert's comments that clients will be  
15 reluctant to hire certified access specialists because they want to avoid audits. She  
16 noted every certified access specialist's work should be reviewed, and every client  
17 should be willing to cooperate in that effort.

18

19 Mr. Michael Mankin commented that Mr. Dostert's caution was realistic. He noted  
20 DSA's role in tracking certified access specialists' work will not subject building owners  
21 to any additional liability. He suggested looking for ways to conduct reviews without  
22 disrupting the marketplace.

23

24 Mr. Smith observed that there seemed to be consensus that DSA should set the  
25 highest priority on complaint investigations. He recommended developing a system to

1 record the types of complaints coming in, identify patterns, and consider possible  
2 solutions.

3

4 In response to Ms. Yeager's comment that everyone should be audited, Mr. Smith said  
5 he envisioned some kind of mentorship program, whereby novice certified access  
6 specialists would receive special oversight from more experienced people during their  
7 first several projects.

8

9 Mr. Smith recommended determining what types of projects must be recorded in the  
10 Certified Access Specialist program (CAsp) recordkeeping system. He noted Mr.  
11 Dostert's concerns about client resistance might be addressed by providing a kind of  
12 "safe harbor" standard; clients could submit some basic set of records as a way of  
13 proving their due diligence in terms of providing access. Committee members  
14 emphasized the need to clarify that the "safe harbor" implied no certification of specific  
15 buildings.

16

17 Mr. Larsen asked what fees DSA planned to charge for certification. Mr. Smith  
18 responded that he did some revenue projections based on estimated investigation  
19 workload. He estimated DSA's potential revenue stream from training, application fees,  
20 and exam fees could be \$500,000 to \$1 million per year. Mr. Smith said DSA expects  
21 to charge approximately \$150 per day for training and \$150 for the exam.

22

23 Mr. Guisasola observed that the revenue stream from training alone will fund a major  
24 part of the program. Mr. Smith agreed, and noted training makes up more than half of  
25 the projected revenue. He suggested keeping this in mind when determining whether  
26 training should be mandatory or voluntary.

1

2 Mr. Larsen commented that permit fees are usually based on the size of a project; he  
3 recommended some kind of sliding fee scale. Mr. Dostert said that in Texas, a certified  
4 specialist registers the project with the state and pays a registration fee based on the  
5 dollar amount of the project. He noted there are different fees for surveys and plan  
6 reviews, and the registered specialist actually pays the fees. He added that those  
7 charges are usually passed on to the client in some manner.

8

9 Mr. Smith reviewed the proposed disciplinary process for certified access specialists.  
10 He said the state's Office of Administrative Hearings has been established specifically  
11 as a resource guide for state agencies for conducting formal hearings, and a process  
12 already exists through that agency. He suggested either using that mechanism or hiring  
13 administrative law judges as necessary.

14

15 Mr. Smith noted the staff has work to do both before and after hearings, including  
16 complaint intake, screening and investigation, and preparation of formal complaints. He  
17 said specific causes for discipline would include violations of the code of conduct,  
18 criminal activity, negligence, and willful misconduct. Mr. Smith reviewed the ethical  
19 standards discussed in the staff report. For the certified access specialist in particular,  
20 he recommended also prohibiting misrepresentation of architectural qualifications,  
21 setting limits on peer review, and deferring matters of conjecture in interpreting buildings  
22 codes and standards. Mr. Smith recommended leaving "murky" areas up to the  
23 discretion of the design professional of record, rather than local building officials or state  
24 investigators.

25

1 Mr. Smith noted the goals of recertification are somewhat different from initial  
2 certification. He suggested talking about recertification details at a future meeting.

3

4 Mr. John Lonberg questioned how “conjecture” is defined. He said that based on his  
5 experience, discussions around this issue usually occur when people are trying to avoid  
6 understanding the plain, clear English meaning of Title 24.

7

8 Mr. Smith noted there are some unclear areas, such as how rough a surface of an  
9 accessible path of travel can be. He said the code has standards about maximum gaps  
10 and sizes, but not all issues are addressed. He expressed his opinion that these  
11 matters of interpretation should be left to the design professional of record. Mr. Smith  
12 agreed with Mr. Lonberg that in many cases, clients try to manipulate the interpretation  
13 to achieve a desired result.

14

15 Mr. Lonberg gave the example of a new shopping area in his city where sidewalks were  
16 poured without a single curb cut. In that case, the client argued that curb cuts were not  
17 necessary until buildings were constructed.

18

19 Mr. Abrams said that in thinking about what Ms. Yeager said, he believed the charge of  
20 DSA’s Certified Access Specialist program should be twofold: first, to make sure  
21 certified access specialists perform competently; and second, legal and ethical  
22 considerations. He noted the first area entails quality assurance, discipline, certification,  
23 recertification, and decertification. For the second, he recommended setting up an  
24 internal process to address ethical problems. Mr. Abrams recommended requiring  
25 certification applicants to disclose any involvement as a plaintiff in an accessibility  
26 lawsuit.



1

2 Mr. Dostert opposed requiring certified access specialists to defer matters of conjecture.  
3 He noted most buildings surveyed are existing buildings, and most have some features  
4 that do not comply with current codes. If certified access specialists identify those  
5 features and propose design solutions, they may be going beyond prescriptive code  
6 requirements. Mr. Smith pointed out it is up to building owners to decide which options  
7 to pursue.

8

9 Mr. Guisasola supported requiring certified access specialists to defer matters of  
10 conjecture, as proposed by the staff. He noted in cases where there is a recognized  
11 difference of opinion, the design professional should decide.

12

13 Mr. Gene Lozano noted inspectors are supposed to be checking to ensure designs are  
14 compliant with Title 24. He suggested also requiring them to notify building owners  
15 when they become aware of features that do not comply with the Americans with  
16 Disabilities Act Access Guidelines (ADAAG). He gave the example of a recently  
17 constructed supermarket where detectable warnings were omitted from a pathway  
18 because its slope was less than a certain ratio. He noted ADAAG requires detectable  
19 warnings regardless of slope. In that case, he said, building officials felt it was not their  
20 role to advise the owner on ADAAG requirements. Mr. Lozano expressed his opinion it  
21 was unfair to property owners not to make them aware of that information.

22

23 Mr. Philip Rubin commented that it was less expensive to be proactive than to be  
24 reactive. He noted there is currently a Title 14 energy audit attached to all building  
25 permits, and suggested doing something similar for accessibility audits. Mr. Rubin

1 emphasized the importance of reviewing access before projects are actually built,  
2 because it is more expensive to fix mistakes after the fact.

3

4 Mr. Larsen said his notes indicate the committee had decided to certify people on codes  
5 and standards, and he asked which codes and standards will be used. He also asked  
6 how conflicts between standards and gray areas will be resolved. He noted there are  
7 various DSA interpretive bulletins that conflict regulations.

8

9 Mr. Smith responded that the program has not yet been developed to the point of  
10 identifying the codes and standards to be used. He said a subject matter expert  
11 committee will be convened, and at that time, the prescribed accessibility codes and  
12 standards will be determined. He added that the standards are likely to extend beyond  
13 the California Building Code (CBC). Mr. Smith acknowledged that there will be some  
14 conflicts between, for example, ADAAG and CBC, but many of those issues will be  
15 resolved in the coming months.

16

17 Mr. Smith noted many local building officials are under the impression they have no  
18 responsibility for enforcing the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Although this  
19 issue may not be addressed in the CBC, the Civil Code clearly indicates a violation of  
20 ADA is also a violation of California's accessibility requirements. He recommended  
21 clarifying this issue with a specific mandate requiring building officials to enforce the  
22 ADA.

23

24 Mr. Lonberg pointed out the Attorney General advised building officials they have no  
25 authority to tell people about the ADA. Mr. Mankin said the AG is aware that this  
26 opinion is somewhat out-of-date and does not reflect recent changes in law. He noted

1 building officials are required by the ADA to abide by applicable federal and state laws.  
2 He added that inaccessible buildings do not comply with state law, so these provisions  
3 should be strengthened.

4

5 In terms of which codes and standards are used, Mr. Mankin said he envisioned the  
6 inspector as having a prescriptive role, with the ability to make recommendations for  
7 how issues should be managed. He observed that the code has certain clear  
8 prescriptive requirements; and beyond that, there are state and federal performance  
9 obligations, such as providing access to people with disabilities; he noted inspectors'  
10 reports should address both areas.

11

12 Mr. Guisasola agreed with Mr. Rubin's comments about working to achieve proactive  
13 compliance. He said lack of clarity at the onset of a project is often to blame when  
14 things go wrong, and he advocated involving a CASp person from the beginning of the  
15 project as a way of avoiding problems later.

16

17 Mr. Guisasola observed that in many cases, local building officials lack the tools to  
18 enforce compliance. He noted having an overall report with an access plan from the  
19 start creates a focus that can be used throughout the design and construction process.

20

21 Mr. Smith said just as all building projects in California have to comply with the  
22 California Environmental Quality Act in order to obtain a building permit, there should be  
23 some questionnaire or form requiring owners to clarify a project's accessibility plan.

24

25 Mr. Dostert expressed his opinion that certified access specialists should be trained and  
26 knowledgeable about all codes and standards that apply, federal and state. He said

1 that when working on a hospital project recently, he discovered federal funds were  
2 involved, so the project had to be made compliant with federal rules. Mr. Dostert noted  
3 a certified access specialist needs to be familiar with Title 24, UFAS, the current  
4 ADAAG and the new ADAAG, and he or she also needs to know which code applies.

5

6 At 11:40 a.m., a short recess was taken. Mr. Higgins reconvened the committee at  
7 11:50 a.m.

8

9 Mr. Higgins expressed his appreciation to participants for their comments. He said he  
10 was excited and encouraged by the progress being made.

11

#### 12 **Progress Recap**

13 Mr. Smith drew attention to the revised certification criteria. He noted the committee  
14 generally accepted the approach of having two classifications, an access compliance  
15 investigator and an access design specialist. He pointed out the revised language  
16 under “Professional Roles” and “Design Services.”

17

18 Mr. Smith reviewed the experience and educational qualifications. He noted DSA plans  
19 to work with the community college system to offer training. He said he discovered 46  
20 programs in construction technology at various community colleges throughout the  
21 state.

22

23 Mr. Lozano asked if DSA planned to recommend certain courses. He said potential  
24 certification candidates would benefit from having a list of recommended classes. Mr.  
25 Smith noted there are certain qualifications, such as the ability to read construction  
26 drawings, and candidates can take courses in those areas to meet the requirements.

1

2 Mr. Jim Vitale said he teaches three classes at Mt. San Antonio College, and all three  
3 deal with ADA. He expressed concern that incorporating ADA in some of the other  
4 colleges' programs will require revising their syllabuses, a process that usually takes  
5 about two years. Mr. Smith noted the first step will be to train the trainers.

6

7 Mr. Smith drew attention to the sensitivity prerequisite.

8

9 Mr. Rubin recommended having some kind of exam to measure the person's  
10 understanding. Mr. Smith noted a certificate of completion of a recognized course could  
11 suffice.

12

13 Mr. Lonberg suggested using the term "disabilities" rather than "disabling conditions."

14

15 Mr. Lonberg noted there is a wide spectrum of disabilities, so understanding one  
16 condition does not necessarily extrapolate to another.

17

18 Ms. Yeager emphasized the need to look at functional limitations and interaction with  
19 the built environment, not the disease or condition.

20

21 Mr. Dostert agreed with Ms. Yeager that the impact should be the primary focus. He  
22 said architects have to learn about disabilities and question the design with that  
23 knowledge in mind. Certified access specialists need proper training and an ability to  
24 scan the environment and spot possible issues.

25

1 Mr. Larsen questioned how well certain aspects of environmental sensitivity, such as  
2 indoor air quality, can be identified from reviewing plans. He noted extensive training  
3 would be needed to learn those areas, and that ability would be difficult to test.

4  
5 Mr. Lozano expressed his opinion that some experiential training is necessary to truly  
6 teach people about the impact of disabilities on the activities of daily life. For example,  
7 he noted, wearing goggles simulating vision deficiencies can teach valuable lessons  
8 about the importance of using high-contrast paint.

9  
10 Mr. Vitale said OSHA conducts five-day “boot camps” to train people for taking exams to  
11 qualify for working on federal projects; the State of Texas has similar three-day boot  
12 camps before their exams. He suggested that California consider offering an initial five-  
13 day boot camp to immerse people in knowledge about types of disabilities and their  
14 impacts in the built world. Mr. Vitale noted the AIA national convention will be held in  
15 Los Angeles in the summer of 2006, and that might be an ideal time to launch the  
16 program.

17  
18 Mr. Dostert noted the term “public accommodation,” used in the first box in the  
19 “Investigator” column, is usually associated with Title 3, so publicly funded or  
20 commercial facilities are left out. He recommended using the term “facilities” instead.  
21 After some discussion, committee members decided to say, “Prepares mitigation plans  
22 to initiate the removal of accessibility barriers.”

23  
24 Mr. Dostert questioned use of the word “approve” in the description of the investigator’s  
25 role. Committee members determined that the words “and approve” should be deleted.”

26

1 Mr. Vitale observed that the materials never state that both types of specialists need to  
2 be able to look at plans and specifications, and he recommended spelling that out in the  
3 “Knowledge” section.

4  
5 **Public Comment**

6 Mr. Higgins welcomed comments from any members of the public.

7  
8 Mr. Vitale expressed concern that the proposed certification program appears to require  
9 a higher standard of care than most existing programs. He noted there may be criticism  
10 that other programs do not have recurring performance evaluations. He also  
11 questioned the emphasis on scores and ranking, which runs contrary to the normal  
12 standard of care for other professionals. Mr. Vitale recommended more of a pass-fail  
13 system instead.

14  
15 Mr. Smith pointed out that the passing point can be determined for each particular test  
16 based on the spread of scores for the pool of people who took the exam. He noted this  
17 issue is one that involves seeking expertise from a psychometrician.

18  
19 Mr. Vitale stated that current law requires attorneys bringing actions against architects  
20 in California to seek out another architect to review the case and certify the action, a  
21 form of “peer review.” He noted California is facing an unprecedented demand for new  
22 schools, new hospitals, and new housing, so there is a huge need for competent  
23 professionals. Mr. Vitale recommended addressing this issue proactively through  
24 training, mentoring, and other such programs.

1 Mr. Gil Delapeña commented that the Department of Parks and Recreation is  
2 concerned with issues that impact the use of leisure and recreation facilities, such as  
3 meeting accessibility needs through equivalent facilitation, or providing access  
4 elsewhere.

5

6 Mr. Abrams noted Title 24 currently requires all recreation participation areas be  
7 accessible, and the new ADAAG will have a component for recreational facilities.

8

9 Mr. Larsen asked if DSA had come up with any way to prevent the tests from being  
10 publicized. Ms. Karen Hodgkins said DSA plans to work with CPS to develop the  
11 questions, maintain custody over the tests, and administer the exams. Mr. Smith noted  
12 a statement can be added warning test-takers that disclosure of exam contents is a  
13 misdemeanor.

14

15 Mr. Vitale noted that in some courses, availability of online testing has resulted in higher  
16 pass rates, typically over 70 percent, because of less restrictive exam settings;  
17 however, the pass rate for oral exams is less than 50 percent in California.

18

19 **Continuing Plans for Program Development**

20 Mr. Higgins invited Mr. Smith to discuss the proposed project schedule.

21

22 Mr. Smith reviewed schedule milestones in exam development, development of training  
23 resources, marketing and public relations, and program launch. He pointed out the  
24 rollout of training will be coordinated to coincide with the period before the exams.

25



1 Mr. Smith said developing the exam entails refining the job analysis, determining the  
2 types and mix of questions, and analyzing specific questions. He estimated that this  
3 activity will take until May. He encouraged committee members to participate as subject  
4 matter experts in designing the test.

5

6 Mr. Guisasola emphasized the need to keep some kind of training program underway  
7 as soon as possible.

8

9 Mr. Dostert asked who will write the exam questions and formulate answers. Mr. Smith  
10 responded that DSA will look to the psychometricians and the subject matter committee  
11 for advice in these areas. He noted each exam will contain a certain number of  
12 experimental questions that will be used for validation purposes.

13

14 Mr. Dostert suggested providing a place on the DSA Web site for questions from the  
15 field and answers.

16

17 Mr. Abrams recommended that the examination include actual plans and specifications.  
18 He asked if the subject matter committee will be open to the public. Ms. Hodgkins  
19 requested that people interested in participating let the staff know.

20

21 Mr. Lonberg suggested looking at the percentages of ADAAG dealing with physical  
22 access, visual access, hearing, and other areas to determine the approximate  
23 percentage of exam questions for each subject. Mr. Smith said the number will also be  
24 based on the percentage of job duties.

25

1 Mr. Lozano pointed out the great complexity of certain subject areas and give them  
2 priority in terms of their relative importance to the state.

3

4 Mr. Lozano also raised the issue of looking at the representation from southern and  
5 northern California. Mr. Dostert expressed his opinion that qualifications rather than  
6 geographical area should be the key factor; other committee members agreed.

7

8 Mr. Smith noted exam alternatives to think about include whether the test should be on  
9 computer as well as paper, and whether it should be an open-book exam.

10

11 Mr. Lozano urged DSA to make sure computer use is accessible to people with various  
12 types of disabilities; he expressed concern about creating any disability bias. He asked  
13 the staff to make sure accessibility is built into the test.

14

15 Mr. Smith suggested identifying the most common types of accommodation requests  
16 and developing solutions.

17

18 Mr. Rubin agreed with Mr. Lozano. He asked what kind of accommodations can be  
19 made for deaf people whose use American Sign Language as their primary language,  
20 for example.

21

22 Mr. Dostert expressed his opinion that it would be appropriate for the test to have the  
23 same level of language complexity as the accessibility codes and standards.

24

25 Mr. Smith observed that considerable work still needs to be done on the program,  
26 including developing definitions of equivalent facilitation, lists of reference standards,

1 and checklists for plan checking. He encouraged committee members to continue  
2 sending worthwhile resource materials to the staff.

3

4 Mr. Mankin cautioned that initiating this program will take a leap of faith at the  
5 beginning, but it may raise new legal issues. He noted there is a tremendous demand  
6 for certified access specialists, so DSA should proceed with program development and  
7 make refinements along the way. He echoed Mr. Smith's invitation to submit  
8 documents, make comments, and contact the staff with suggestions.

9

10 Mr. Guisasola asked how many people will be on the subject matter expert committee.

11 Mr. Smith said DSA may create two committees, one for each type of certification. He  
12 added that he envisioned eight to ten members on each committee.

13

14 Ms. Hodgkins noted the subject matter expert committee should include architects and  
15 building officials to ensure an appropriate mix of expertise.

16

17 Mr. Larsen noted certain sections of the code are currently being revised, and he asked  
18 how such changes will be handled in the testing process. Mr. Mankin said the  
19 parameters for each test will have to be determined in advance. Mr. Larsen observed  
20 that emergency regulations might be able to clarify those situations. Mr. Dostert added  
21 that the exam developers are likely to avoid testing on provisions that are known to be  
22 under revision.

23

24 Mr. Lozano asked the committee to reconsider the issue of subspecialty certification  
25 areas. He clarified he supported what was being proposed by the staff. He noted that  
26 at the last meeting, the committee never had a chance to react to the proposal he and

1 Ms. Sharon Toji had developed. Mr. Lozano recommended that the committee make its  
2 position clear at this meeting.

3

4 Mr. Smith said the committee wanted to defer this item until Mr. Lozano was present.

5

6 Mr. Guisasola expressed his opinion that the major thrust of the training and testing  
7 should be on knowing how to find and use resources, rather than knowing ADAAG or  
8 any other codes. He said specialists need to be familiar enough with accessibility laws  
9 to be able to determine what applies. For that reason, he noted, the ability to find code  
10 sections would be an important skill.

11

12 Mr. Dostert expressed support for Mr. Lozano's recommendation to create a signage  
13 specialist. He said after thinking about it, he was unable to identify any other areas that  
14 warranted a separate certification. Using Ms. Toji as an example, Mr. Lozano noted  
15 there are people with considerable expertise in signage who lack familiarity with codes  
16 and other areas.

17

18 Mr. Dostert proposed that the committee consider establishing this new signage  
19 specialty category at some point in the future.

20

21 Mr. Abrams made a motion to recommend to DSA that the issue of designating a  
22 subspecialty for signage be brought up and addressed before the first recertification  
23 period expires, or three years after the first certifications are granted. The motion was  
24 seconded by Mr. Lonberg.

25

1 Mr. Larsen said in working at community colleges, he finds there are other specialty  
2 areas that are more prevalent than signage, such as overall site accessibility, building  
3 accessibility, and streets and sidewalks.

4

5 Committee members agreed that other specialty areas should also be considered when  
6 signage is addressed. With that amendment, the motion was approved unanimously.

7

8 **State Architect Update**

9 Mr. Higgins invited Acting State Architect Richard Conrad to address the committee.

10

11 Mr. Conrad expressed his appreciation to the committee for its diligent work in creating  
12 the Certified Access Specialist program, and he commended committee members and  
13 staff for their progress so far. He recognized the importance of getting the program up  
14 and running, but also continuing to make improvements.

15

16 Mr. Conrad clarified that he was acting as State Architect on a temporary basis until a  
17 permanent replacement can be found.

18

19 Mr. Conrad reported that the Little Hoover Commission and the Governor's Office have  
20 not yet completed their review of the California Performance Review report and the  
21 results of the public hearings.

22

23 Mr. Conrad noted DSA is seeing a significant increase in workload due to the recent  
24 passage of state and local school bonds. He said the community college system is  
25 expecting to spend as much as \$14 billion on facilities over the next three years, and K-

1 12 activity is also increasing. He added that staffing limitations make the workload  
2 challenging, but he expressed confidence in DSA's ability to serve its customers.

3

4 Mr. Conrad asked the staff to find out how many building permit applications are filed  
5 each year. He said he was working on legislation to give DSA a share of the permit  
6 fees.

7

8 Mr. Conrad stated that he was very impressed with the administration of the CASp  
9 program, and he thanked Ms. Hodgkins, Mr. Smith, and the staff for their efforts.

10

11 Mr. Conrad announced that DSA has created free videos for hotel and restaurant  
12 employees, law enforcement, and other areas. He asked people to let him know if there  
13 were interested in receiving copies.

14

15 **Wrap-Up/Adjournment**

16 There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:30 p.m.